

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

-v-

ALBERTO WILLIAM VILAR, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 05-cr-621 (RJS)

ORDER

RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, Circuit Judge:

On September 30, 2021, the Court dismissed a third-party petition filed by Lauranne Christov in connection with the Court’s August 2, 2019 Preliminary Order of Forfeiture as to Substitute Assets. (Doc. No. 972 (“MTD Order”).) Ms. Christov, who is proceeding pro se, thereafter filed a motion for leave to appeal in forma pauperis (“IFP”) (Doc. No. 988) and a motion for permission for electronic case filing (Doc. No. 1003). For the reasons set forth below, the Court DENIES Ms. Christov’s motions.

“An appeal may not be taken in forma pauperis if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). “Good faith” can be demonstrated when a plaintiff “seeks appellate review of any issue [that is] not frivolous.” *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). Here, Ms. Christov does not meet this standard, as she cannot raise any nonfrivolous claim on appeal. The Court dismissed her petition for lack of statutory standing because she failed to demonstrate “a legal interest in the forfeited property.” MTD Order at 6–7 (quoting *United States v. Watts*, 786 F.3d 152, 161 (2d Cir. 2015).) Specifically, the Court found that she lacked an enforceable judgement and had alleged no ties to the specific assets at issue. MTD Order at 7. In her motion to proceed IFP, Ms. Christov states only that she

“respectfully disagree[s]” with the Court’s judgment and believes her husband was a victim of the Defendants’ fraudulent scheme. (Doc. No. 988 at 1.)

Because Ms. Christov’s appeal “lacks an arguable basis in fact or law,” *Tavarez v. Reno*, 54 F.3d 109, 110 (2d Cir. 1995), her motion to proceed IFP is denied.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, her motion for permission for electronic case filing is denied, as the Court sees no need for Ms. Christov – who is a third party to this action – to electronically file documents after her third-party petition has already been dismissed.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to terminate the motions pending at Doc. Nos. 988 and 1003.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 12, 2022  
New York, New York



RICHARD J. SULLIVAN  
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE  
Sitting by Designation

---

<sup>1</sup> Ms. Christov has appealed the Court’s September 30, 2021 order and has also requested permission from the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to proceed IFP. *See Coppedge*, 369 U.S. at 445 (“If the District Court finds the application is not in good faith, and therefore denies leave to appeal in forma pauperis, the [plaintiff] may seek identical relief from the Court of Appeals.”).